



CITY OF LONG BEACH

DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND BUILDING

333 West Ocean Boulevard, 5th Floor

Long Beach, CA 90802

FAX (562) 570-6753

ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING

\$25.00 FILING FEE

NOTICE OF PREPARATION

To: Office of the County Clerk
Environmental Filings
12400 E. Imperial Highway, #1101
Norwalk, CA 90650

From: Community & Environmental Planning Division
Department of Planning and Building
333 West Ocean Boulevard, 5th Floor
Long Beach, CA 90802

Date Mailed:

In conformance with Section 15082 of the State CEQA Guidelines, please post this notice for period of 20 days. Enclosed is the required fee of \$25.00 for processing.

Notice is hereby given that the Long Beach City Planning Commission, Lead Agency for purposes of CEQA, proposes to adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration for the project listed below:

1. **Project Location:**

2. **Project Title:**

3. **Project Description:**

4. Review period during which the Lead Agency will receive comments on the proposed mitigated Negative Declaration:

Starting Date:

Ending Date:

5. Public Meeting of the Planning Commission

Date:

Time: 1:30 p.m.

Location: City Council Chambers
Long Beach City Hall
333 West Ocean Boulevard, Plaza Level

6. Copies of the report and all referenced documents are available for review by contacting the undersigned, or on the web at: www.longbeach.gov/plan/content/enviromn.htm.
7. The site is not on any list as enumerated under Section 65965.5 of the California Government Code.
8. The Initial Study may find significant adverse impacts to occur to the following resource areas:
9. The Negative Declaration has no significant impacts to occur.

For additional information contact:

333 West Ocean Boulevard, Floor
Long Beach, CA 90802

CITY OF LONG BEACH
PLANNING COMMISSION

NEGATIVE DECLARATION

PROJECT:

I. TITLE:

II. PROPONENT

III. DESCRIPTION

IV. LOCATION

V. HEARING DATE & TIME

VI. HEARING LOCATION

City Council Chambers
Long Beach City Hall
333 West Ocean Boulevard, Plaza Level

NEGATIVE DECLARATION

FINDING:

In accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act, the Long Beach City Planning Commission has conducted an Initial Study to determine whether the following project may have a significant adverse effect on the environment. On the basis of that study, the Commission hereby finds that the proposed project will not have a significant adverse effect on the environment and does not require the preparation of an Environmental Impact Report because the Mitigation Measures described in the initial study have been added to the project.

Signature: _____ Date: _____

- * If you wish to appeal the appropriateness or adequacy of this document, address your written comments to our finding that the project will not have a significant adverse effect on the environment: (1) identify the environmental effect(s), why they would occur, and why they would be significant, and (2) suggest any mitigation measures which you believe would eliminate or reduce the effect to an acceptable level. Regarding item (1) above, explain the basis for your comments and submit any supporting data or references.

This document and supporting attachments are provided for review by the general public. This is an information document about environmental effects only. Supplemental information is on file and may be reviewed in the office listed above. The decision making body will review this document and potentially many other sources of information before considering the proposed project.

INITIAL STUDY

Prepared by:

City of Long Beach
Community and Environmental Planning
333 West Ocean Boulevard, Fifth Floor
Long Beach, California 90802

INITIAL STUDY

- 1. Project title:**
- 2. Lead agency name and address:**
- 3. Contact person and phone number:**
- 4. Project location:**
- 5. Project sponsor's name and address:**
- 6. General Plan:**
- 7. Zoning:**

8. Description of project:

9. Surrounding land uses and setting:

10. Other public agencies whose approval is required:

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

Aesthetics	Agriculture Resources	Air Quality
Biological Resources	Cultural Resources	Geology/Soils
Hazards & Hazardous Materials	Hydrology/Water Quality	Land Use/Planning
Mineral Resources	National Pollution Discharge Elimination System	Noise
Population/Housing	Public Services	Recreation
Transportation	Utilities/Service Systems	Mandatory Findings of Significance

DETERMINATION:

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

I find that the proposed project **COULD NOT** have a significant effect on the Environment and a **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.

I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. **A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.

I find that the proposed project **MAY** have a significant effect on the environment, and an **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required.

I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENT IMPACTS:

- 1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parenthesis following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g. the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g. the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
- 2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
- 3) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
- 4) "Negative Declaration: Less than Significant with A Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from Section XVII, "Earlier Analyses," may be cross-referenced).
- 5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration Section 1 5063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated", describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
- 6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I. AESTHETICS – Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?				
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?				
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?				
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?				
II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES – In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:				
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?				
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?				
c) Involve other changes in the existing environment that, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use?				
III. AIR QUALITY – Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?				
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?				
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?				
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?				

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES – Would the project:

- a) Have a substantial adverse impact, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service?
- b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service?
- c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?
- d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?
- e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?				

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES – Would the project:

- a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section §15064.5?
- b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section §15064.5?
- c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?
- d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS – Would the project:

- a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:
 - i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.
 - ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?
 - iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including Liquefaction?
 - iv) Landslides?
- b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?
- c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?				
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?				

VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS –

Would the project:

- a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?
- b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?
- c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?
- d) Be located on a site, which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?
- e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?
- f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?
- g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?
- h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY – Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?				
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?				
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?				
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?				
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?				
f) Otherwise degrade water quality?				
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?				
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?				
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?				
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?				

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	---	------------------------------------	--------------

IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING – Would the project:

- a) Physically divide an established community?
- b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?
- c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?

X. MINERAL RESOURCES – Would the project:

- a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?
- b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?

XI. NATIONAL POLLUTION DISCHARGE ELIMINATION SYSTEM – Would the project:

- a) Result in a significant loss of pervious surface?
- b) Create a significant discharge of pollutants into the storm drain or water way?
- c) Violate any best management practices of the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System permit?

XII. NOISE – Would the project result in:

- a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?
- b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or ground-borne noise levels?

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?				
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?				
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				

XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING – Would the project:

- a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?
- b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?
- c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES – Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

- a) Fire protection?
- b) Police protection?
- c) Schools?
- d) Parks?
- e) Other public facilities?

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XV. RECREATION –				
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?				
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?				
XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC – Would the project:				
a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?				
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?				
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?				
d) Substantially increase hazards to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?				
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?				
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?				
g) Conflict with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?				
XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS –				
Would the project:				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlement and resources, or are new or expanded entitlement needed?				
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?				
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?				
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?				

XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE –

- a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?
- b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?
- c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

DISCUSSION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

I. AESTHETICS

A. Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

Less Than Significant Impact:

The proposed project, the redevelopment of a portion of Bixby Park, would occur south of Ocean Boulevard along the top of the slope, along the bluff, and at the toe of the slope on public recreation property. Most of the project would not be visible from Ocean Boulevard while all of the new amenities would be visible from the beach. The view of the Pacific Ocean and the coastline in both directions would not be substantially affected by the proposed project.

B. Would the project substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?

Less Than Significant Impact:

In the Scenic Routes Element of the City of Long Beach General Plan, Ocean Boulevard is identified as both a Scenic Corridor and a Scenic Route. The proposed project would impact the portion of Bixby Park located south of Ocean Boulevard, including the bluff. As the bluff is in a state of erosion, the proposed stabilization and planting of new native California groundcover would not be expected to substantially damage the existing resources at the project site. Located just south of the project boundary is an historic lifeguard building and boat storage area. While new storage for events will be added on to the boat storage area, the lifeguard building will not be affected.

C. Would the project substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?

Less Than Significant Impact:

The project proposes to stabilize and improve the status of the existing bluff at Bixby Park. The improvement plans follow the policy of the 2000 Plan of Development, Bluff Erosion and Enhancement Project to reduce bluff erosion and facilitate additional recreational activities.

Also, please also see I (a) supra for discussion.

D. Would the project create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation:

While the proposed project would be anticipated to introduce some additional light sources to illuminate the new pathways and amenities, the surrounding area is already illuminated with substantial nighttime lighting. The following mitigation measure is included to ensure the correct level and direction of all newly installed light sources:

- I-1 All exterior security lighting and decorative lighting installed at the project site shall include light and glare shields so as to avoid any light intrusion onto adjacent or abutting residential buildings pursuant to Section 21.41.259.

II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES

The project site is not located within an agricultural zone, and there are no agricultural zones within the vicinity of the project. The proposed project is located within a section of the city that has been developed for three quarters of a century. The proposed redevelopment and improvements to Bixby Park will have no effect upon agricultural resources within the City of Long Beach or any other neighboring city or county.

III. AIR QUALITY

The South Coast Air Basin is subject to some of the worst air pollution in the country, attributable mainly to its topography, climate, meteorological conditions, a large population base, and highly dispersed urban land use patterns.

Air quality conditions are primarily affected by the rate and location of pollutant emissions and by climatic conditions that influence the movement and dispersion of pollutants. Atmospheric conditions such as wind speed, wind direction, and air temperature gradients, along with local and regional topography, provide the links between air pollutant emissions and air quality.

The South Coast Air Basin generally has a limited capability to disperse air contaminants because of its low wind speeds and persistent temperature inversions. In the Long Beach area, predominantly daily

winds consist of morning onshore airflow from the southwest at a mean speed of 7.3 miles per hour and afternoon and evening offshore airflow from the northwest at 0.2 to 4.7 miles per hour with little variability between seasons. Summer wind speeds average slightly higher than winter wind speeds. The prevailing winds carry air contaminants northward and then eastward over Whittier, Covina, Pomona and Riverside.

The majority of pollutants normally found in the Los Angeles County atmosphere originate from automobile exhausts as unburned hydrocarbons, carbon monoxide, oxides of nitrogen and other materials. Of the five major pollutant types (carbon monoxide, nitrogen oxides, reactive organic gases, sulfur oxides, and particulates), only sulfur oxide emissions are dominated by sources other than automobile exhaust.

A. Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable Air Quality Attainment Plan?

No Impact:

The Southern California Association of Governments has determined that if a project is consistent with the growth forecasts for the sub region in which it is located, it is consistent with the Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) and regional emissions are mitigated by the control strategy specified in the AQMP. The project is consistent with the goals of the City of Long Beach Air Quality Element that calls for achieving air quality improvements in a manner that continues economic growth. No impact is anticipated.

B. Would the project violate any air quality standard or contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation?

Less than Significant Impact:

The California Air Resources Board regulates mobile emissions and oversees the activities of county Air Pollution Control Districts (APCDs) and regional Air Quality Management Districts (AQMDs) in California. The South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) is the regional agency empowered to regulate stationary and mobile sources in the South Coast Air Basin.

To determine whether a project generates sufficient quantities of air pollution to be considered significant, the SCAQMD adopted maximum thresholds of significance for mobile and stationary producers in the South Coast Air Basin (SCAB), (i.e., cars, trucks, buses and energy consumption). SCAQMD Conformity Procedures (Section 6.3 of the

CEQA Air Quality Handbook, April 1993) states that all government actions that generate emission greater than the following thresholds are considered regionally significant (see Table 1).

Table 1. SCAQMD Significance Thresholds

Pollutant	Construction Thresholds (lbs/day)	Operational Thresholds (lbs/day)
ROC	75	55
NO _x	100	55
CO	550	550
PM ₁₀	150	150
SO _x	150	150

Construction emissions are estimated to be below threshold levels. The estimated emissions produced during the duration of the construction would be based upon the overall project site over a period of six months and would represent a worst-case scenario. The source of these estimates is based upon URBEMIS 2002 Air Emissions for Land Development Software calculations. The table below indicates the results.

	ROC	NO _x	CO	PM ₁₀
Project Emissions	29.2	56.42	51.30	7.8
AQMD Thresholds	75	100	550	150
Exceeds Thresholds	No	No	No	No

Estimated automobile emissions from the project are listed in the table below. The sources of these estimates are based on CEQA Air Quality Handbook, revised 1993, Table 9-7 Screening Table for Estimating Mobile Source Operation Emissions. The primary source of operational emissions is vehicle trips of which this project is unlikely to produce significant new vehicle trips. Please also see XVI (a) and (b) supra for discussion. Based upon these estimates, the proposed project would not exceed threshold levels for mobile emissions. The following table indicates the results.

	ROC	NO _x	CO	PM ₁₀
Exhaust Emissions	8.88	5.28	87.36	.72
AQMD Thresholds	55	55	550	150
Exceeds Thresholds	No	No	No	No

- C. Would the project result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?**

Less Than Significant Impact:

Please see III (a) and (b) supra for discussion.

- D. Would the project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?**

No Impact:

The CEQA Air Quality Handbook defines sensitive receptors as children, athletes, the elderly, and sick individuals that are more susceptible to the effects of air pollution than the population at large. The proposed project would not be anticipated to produce significant levels of any emission that could affect sensitive receptors.

- E. Would the project create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?**

No Impact:

Because of its location, the construction and operation of the proposed project would not be expected to create any objectionable odors that would affect a substantial number of people.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

The site of the proposed project is a City park located along a scenic corridor adjacent to the Pacific Ocean. Residential properties of different densities are located nearby and commercial land uses are located within two blocks. The vegetation is sporadic along the bluff minimal and consists of common horticultural species in landscaped areas. There is no evidence of rare or sensitive species as listed in Title 14 of the

California Code of Regulations or Title 50 of the Federal Code of Regulations.

The proposed site is not located in a protected wetlands area. Also, the development of the proposed project is not anticipated to interfere with the migratory movement of any wildlife species. The biological habitat and species diversity is limited to that typically found in highly populated and urbanized Southern California settings.

No adverse impacts would be anticipated to biological resources.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES

There is some evidence to indicate that primitive people inhabited portions of the city as early as 5,000 to 2,000 B.C. Much of the remains and artifacts of these ancient people have been destroyed as the city has been developed. Of the archaeological sites remaining, many of them seem to be located in the southeast sector of the city.

A. Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section §15064.5?

No Impact.

The proposed project would have no impact on any historical resource.

B. Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section §15064.5?

No Impact.

The proposed grading and improvements may require some disturbance to the bluff. However, due to previous activity on the bluff, the required disturbance is not anticipated to impact any unknown latent artifacts. In addition, the project site is located outside the area of the City expected to have the higher probability of latent artifacts. No adverse impacts are anticipated to cultural resources.

C. Would the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

No Impact.

Please see V. (b) supra for discussion.

D. Would the project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

No Impact.

Please see V. (b) supra for discussion.

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

The proposed project would be located south of Ocean Boulevard along the bluff and on the beach on public recreation land. Portions of the project would be on the top, slope and toe of the bluff.

A. Would the project expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:

Less Than Significant Impact.

i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.

While no faults are known to pass directly beneath the project site, the nearest possible inferred fault would be about one and one half miles away. The project site is approximately two miles outside of the Alquist-Priolo Special Study Zone. The most significant fault system in the Long Beach area is the Newport-Inglewood Zone. Other potentially active faults in the vicinity are the Richfield Fault, the Marine Stadium Fault, the Palos Verdes Fault and the Los Alamitos Fault. No significant impact is anticipated.

ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?

The relative close proximity of the Newport-Inglewood Fault could create substantial ground shaking at the proposed site if a seismic event occurred along the fault. However, there are numerous variables that determine the level of damage to a given location. Given these variables it is not possible to determine the level of damage that may occur on the site during a seismic event. However, the tenant improvement construction must conform to all

current state and local building codes. No significant impact is anticipated.

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including Liquefaction?

According to the Seismic Safety Element of the City's General Plan (Plate 7), the proposed project is located on land that has the most minimal potential for liquefaction. Also according to the Seismic Safety Element (Plate 11), the beach adjacent to the project site is an area of land that is susceptible to Tsunami run-up.

iv) Landslides?

One of the goals of the proposed project would be to stabilize the bluff to prevent further erosion. The planned improvements to the bluff would be in conformance with the policies of the 2000 Plan of Development, Bluff Erosion and Enhancement Project. The project would not be anticipated to promote landslides.

B. Would the project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

Less Than Significant Impact.

Grading during preparation of the proposed project could result in some soil erosion. However, one of the goals of the project would be to stabilize the bluff and add native California groundcover. No substantial amount of erosion or loss of topsoil would be anticipated.

C. Would the project be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?

Less Than Significant Impact.

Please see VI. (b) supra for discussion.

D. Would the project be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?

No Impact.

The project site is not located in an area of expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994).

- E. Would the project have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?**

No Impact.

Existing sewer infrastructure is in place where the proposed project would be located. There would not be a need for a septic tank system or an alternative wastewater disposal system.

VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

- A. Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?**

No Impact:

The proposed project would be the redevelopment of, and the addition of improvements and amenities to, a City park. The proposed project would not be anticipated to create any significant hazard to the public or the environment via the use, transport or disposal of hazardous materials.

- B. Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?**

No Impact.

Please see VII (a) supra for discussion.

- C. Would the project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?**

No Impact:

The proposed project is not a land use that would be anticipated to emit hazardous emissions or involve the handling of hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances or waste. For the record, the

nearest school is at the northwest corner of Junipero Avenue and 4th Street. Also, please see VII (a) supra for discussion.

D. Would the project be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?

No Impact:

The Hazardous Waste and Substances Sites (Cortese) List is a planning document used by the State, local agencies and developers to comply with the California Environmental Quality Act requirements in providing information about the location of hazardous materials release sites. The Cortese List does not list the proposed project site as contaminated with hazardous materials.

E. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

No Impact:

The proposed project site is not located within the airport land use plan.

F. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

No Impact:

Please see VII (e) supra for discussion.

G. Would the project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

No Impact:

The proposed project would be accessible from Ocean Boulevard and from the existing public parking lot located south and southeast of the project site. The proposed project would not be expected to impair implementation of or physically interfere with any adopted emergency response plan.

H. Would the project expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wild land fires, including where wild lands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wild lands?

No Impact:

The proposed site is within an urbanized setting and will not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wild land fires.

VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

The Flood Insurance Administration has prepared a new Flood Hazard Map designating potential flood zones, (Based on the projected inundation limits for breach of the Hansen Dam and that of the Whittier Narrows Dam, as well as the 100-year flood as delineated by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers) which was adopted in July 1998.

The project site is not located within a FEMA designated flood zone (X zone designation). The proposed project would comply with all state and federal requirements pertaining to preservation of water quality.

A. Would the project violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?

No Impact:

Development of the proposed project would not violate any waste-water discharge standards. The project site is in an urbanized area. All storm and sanitary sewer drains are currently in place and the site is fully developed.

B. Would the project substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?

No Impact

While construction of the proposed project would involve some minor grading or excavation, it would not be expected to impact or interfere with the groundwater supply. Nor would operation of the proposed land use be expected to adversely affect groundwater supplies.

C. Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?

Less Than Significant Impact:

The stabilization and improvements, including the creation of a granite walkway and two new stairways could alter the existing drainage pattern on the bluff. The alteration, however, would not be considered substantial.

D. Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on-or off-site?

Less Than Significant Impact:

Please see VIII (c) supra for discussion.

E. Would the project create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems?

Less Than Significant Impact.:

The proposed project would create runoff, but not to a level that would exceed the capacity of the existing storm water drainage system.

F. Would the project place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?

No Impact:

The proposed project does not include any residential land uses and, therefore, will not place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area.

G. Would the project place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?

No Impact:

The project site is not located within a 100-year flood hazard area.

H. Would the project expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?

Less Than Significant Impact:

The proposed project would be located adjacent to beach area that would be susceptible to Tsunami run-up. The project site would be not be influenced by the inundation of seiche, strong currents or mudflow, as shown in the Long Beach Seismic Element.

IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING

A. Would the project physically divide an established community?

No Impact:

The proposed project would be the redevelopment of Bixby Park, including the addition of improvements and amenities. The two neighborhoods located closest to Bixby Park are Alamitos Beach and Bluff Park. The redevelopment of a portion of Bixby Park would not divide any established community.

B. Would the project conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

No Impact:

The project site would be located in the City's General Plan Land Use District, #11, Open Space/Parks, and in the Park ("P") Zoning district. Land in the Park ("P") district is established to set aside and preserve publicly owned park areas for public use and for recreational, cultural and social service activities.

The project would also be located within Area B of the Local Coastal Program (LCP). The LCP recommends that the area between Ocean Boulevard and the beach be preserved with recreational amenities.

C. Would the project conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?

No Impact:

As stated previously, the proposed project would comply with the 2000 Plan of Development, Bluff Erosion and Enhancement Project. Along with protecting the bluff from erosion, the project would introduce additional recreational improvements to that portion of Bixby Park.

X. MINERAL RESOURCES

The primary mineral resource within the City of Long Beach has been oil. From the beginning of this century, oil extraction operations within the city have diminished as this resource has become depleted due to extraction operations. Today oil extraction continues but on a much reduced scale in comparison to that which occurred in the past. The proposed site does not contain any oil extraction operations and development of the proposed project would not be anticipated to have a negative impact on this resource. There are no other known mineral resources on the site that could be negatively impacted by development.

A. Would the project result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?

No Impact.

Implementation of the proposed project would include the stabilization of an existing bluff and the introduction of additional recreational amenities to Bixby Park. The proposed project would not result in the loss of availability of any known mineral resource.

B. Would the project result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?

No Impact.

Please see X (a) supra for discussion.

XI. NATIONAL POLLUTION DISCHARGE ELIMINATION SYSTEM (NPDES)

The National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) regulation of the amended 1972 Clean Water Act requires applicable projects to obtain an NPDES permit and comply with the applicable requirements. The intent of the Act is to reduce, to the maximum extent practical, water borne pollutants from entering storm water drainage systems and reaching water bodies, such as oceans, lakes and rivers.

The Los Angeles County Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) is the lead agency for enforcing NPDES regulations. In June 1999, the City of Long Beach sought and received a separate NPDES permit from the RWQCB which allows the City to administer and enforce NPDES regulations within its jurisdiction. The Department of Planning and Building is charged with processing and enforcing NPDES regulations.

A. Would the project result in a significant loss of pervious surface?

Less Than Significant Impact:

Development of the proposed project would involve stabilization of the bluff at Bixby Park and accompanying recreational improvements. Two new stairways and a granite walkway would be part of the improvements. In addition to a grading plan, a drainage plan would be required to demonstrate the proposed drainage. The plan would need to be improved by the City. Any impacts relative to NPDES would be expected to be less than significant.

B. Would the project create a significant discharge of pollutants into the storm drain or water way?

Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation.

The proposed project would include the stabilization of the bluff at Bixby Park and the addition of new amenities. With Best Management Practices (BMPs), the proposed project would not be expected to create a significant discharge of pollutants into the nearest storm drain or water way. The following mitigation measure is included to ensure that BMPs are followed.

- XI-1 Prior to the release of the grading permit, the applicant shall prepare and submit for approval a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) that covers all activity during grading and construction of the project. The SWPPP shall

include all appropriate construction site Best Management Practices (BMPs) as listed on the project plans.

C. Would the project violate any best management practices of the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System permit?

No Impact.

Please see XI (b) supra for discussion.

XII. NOISE

Noise is defined as unwanted sound that disturbs human activity. Environmental noise levels typically fluctuate over time, and different types of noise descriptors are used to account for this variability. Measuring noise levels involves intensity, frequency, and duration, as well as time of occurrence.

Some land uses are considered more sensitive to ambient noise levels than other uses, due to the amount of noise exposure and the types of activities involved. Residences, motels, hotels, schools, libraries, churches, nursing homes, auditoriums, parks and outdoor recreation areas are generally more sensitive to noise than are commercial and industrial land uses.

The City of Long Beach uses the State Noise/Land Use Compatibility Standards, which suggests a desirable exterior noise exposure at 65 dBA CNEL for sensitive land uses such as residences. Less sensitive commercial and industrial uses may be compatible with ambient noise levels up to 70 dBA. The City of Long Beach has an adopted Noise Ordinance that sets exterior and interior noise standards.

A. Would the project result in the exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance or applicable standards of other agencies?

Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation

Development of the proposed project would be expected to create some noise levels in excess of those established by the Long Beach City Ordinance. Project construction must conform to the Noise Ordinance. As stated in §8.80.202, "no person shall operate or permit the operation of any tools or equipment used for construction, alternation, repair, remodeling, drilling, demolition or any other related

building activity which would produce loud or unusual noise which annoys or disturbs a reasonable person of normal sensitivity between the hours of seven p.m. and seven a.m.” The following mitigation measure shall be included to ensure compliance with the Noise Ordinance:

XI-1 Any person(s) associated with the proposed project shall only operate or permit the operation of any tools or equipment used for site preparation, construction or any other related building activity which produce loud or unusual noise which annoys or disturbs a reasonable person of normal sensitivity between the following hours:

Weekdays	7:00am to 7:00pm
Saturdays	9:00am to 6:00pm
Sundays	No work permitted.
Holidays	No work permitted

B. Would the project result in the exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels?

Less Than Significant Impact:

Development of the proposed project would be expected to include some construction noise that would be beyond the ambient noise level for the area. Such noise would not be expected to be ground borne vibrations or noises.

C. Would the project create a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

Less Than Significant Impact:

The proposed project would include picnic tables, an outdoor stage, a skate plaza and three play areas. During the period of construction, development of the proposed project could cause temporary increases in the ambient noise levels. These increases would not be expected to exceed established standards. Once the construction phase of the project is complete, the noise levels created by the proposed project would be expected to be fairly consistent and non-disruptive.

D. Would the project create a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

Less than Significant Impact.

The proposed project would not be expected to create a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity. However, there could be occasional events at the outdoor stage that would create noise levels beyond what is typical in the project vicinity. These noise levels, although greater than what is typical, would not be expected to be substantial.

- E. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?**

No Impact:

The proposed project at Bixby Park is not located within the airport land use plan.

- F. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area excessive noise levels?**

No Impact:

See discussion XII (e) supra.

XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING

The City of Long Beach is the second largest city in Los Angeles County and the fifth largest in California. According to the 2000 Census, Long Beach has a population of 461,522, which presents a 7.5 percent increase from the 1990 Census.

The proposed project would not create new housing, nor would it displace any existing housing. The proposed project would not be anticipated to have any significant impact on the population of the City of Long Beach or on the demand for housing.

XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES

Fire protection is provided by the Long Beach Fire Department. The Department has 23 in-city stations. The Department is divided into

Fire Prevention, Fire Suppression, Bureau of Instruction, and the Bureau of Technical Services. The Fire Department is accountable for medical, paramedic, and other first aid rescue calls from the community.

The Long Beach Police Department serves the project site. The Department is divided into Patrol, Traffic, Detective, Juvenile, Vice, Community, Jail, Records, and Administration Sections. The City has four Patrol Divisions; East, West, North and South.

The City of Long Beach is primarily served by the Long Beach Unified School District, which also serves the Cities of Signal Hill, and most of Lakewood. The District has been operating at or over capacity.

Would the proposed project have an adverse impact upon any of the following public services:

A. Fire protection?

Less Than Significant Impact.

The proposed project would create additional outdoor recreational areas where accidents could occur and residents could require assistance. The development plans for the project include an information kiosk and pay telephone near the bike path and new toilet and shower building. In addition, there is an existing lifeguard office adjacent to the amenities on the beach level.

B. Police protection?

Less Than Significant Impact.

Bixby Park is located along the boundaries of two Police divisions, the South and the East. Based upon demand, the Police Department would determine which division would provide primary coverage and which division would provide back-up coverage of the proposed project area. The proposed project will be adjacent to an existing public parking lot that is already part of a patrol area.

C. Schools?

No Impact:

The proposed project would have no impact upon the Long Beach Unified School District.

D. Parks?

Less Than Significant Impact.

The proposed project is the redevelopment and improvement of Bixby Park. The park will include new amenities on underutilized parkland on the bluff, along the slope and at the toe of the slope on the beach. The City's Park Rangers will be involved in patrolling the new amenities. Overall, the proposed project would be expected to have a positive impact upon the City's park facilities.

E. Other public facilities?

No Impact:

Not applicable.

XV. RECREATION

A. Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?

Less Than Significant Impact:

The proposed project, the redevelopment of the portion of Bixby Park located south of Ocean Boulevard, could be expected to result in an increase in the use of Bixby Park. Some of the new amenities may also be utilized by present users of the park who currently access the portion of the park located north of Ocean Boulevard. The proposed project would not be anticipated to accelerate the physical deterioration of Bixby Park. The project includes the stabilization of the bluff, thus reducing erosion and enhancing the bluff for users of the park.

B. Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

Less Than Significant Impact:

Please see XV (a) supra for discussion.

XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

Since 1980, Long Beach has experienced significant growth. Continued growth is expected into the next decade. Inevitably, growth will generate additional demand for travel. Without proper planning and necessary transportation improvements, this increase in travel demand, if unmanaged, could result in gridlock on freeways and streets, and jeopardize the tranquility of residential neighborhoods.

- A. Would the project cause an increase in traffic, which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?**

Less than Significant Impact:

The proposed project would not be expected to cause a substantial increase in traffic that would exceed the capacity of the street system. The proposed project would be located adjacent to an existing public parking lot that is accessed by anyone interested in reaching the beach. The project does not require the creation of any new streets or traffic improvement. The new improvements and amenities installed at the park would be accessible to residents who presently visit Bixby Park as well as any visitor to the beach.

- B. Would the project exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?**

Less than Significant Impact:

Please see XVI (a) supra for discussion.

- C. Would the project result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?**

No Impact:

The proposed project is unrelated to air traffic and would have no impact upon air traffic patterns.

- D. Would the project substantially increase hazards to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?**

No Impact:

The proposed project would not have an impact on any circulation pattern or be expected to substantially increase the hazard of any design feature. Users of the new amenities at Bixby Park would use the existing Junipero Avenue access to reach the existing public parking lot at the beach.

E. Would the project result in inadequate emergency access?

No Impact.

The improvements and amenities created by the proposed project would be accessed via Junipero Avenue, which is the access that is currently used to also reach the beach. If a visitor to the new amenities or a visitor to the beach were to need emergency assistance, the Junipero Avenue would be the necessary route for emergency personnel to use.

F. Would the project result in inadequate parking capacity?

Less Than Significant Impact:

The proposed project would occur on the portion of Bixby Park that is located south of Ocean Boulevard. That portion of the park is located adjacent to an existing public parking lot that contains approximately 400 parking spaces. Parallel parking spaces also exist on portions of Junipero Avenue south of Ocean Boulevard. The project would not result in an inadequate parking supply on a day-to-day basis. In the case of a special event (i.e. the 4th of July or a sea festival, etc.) an inadequate parking supply would exist all along the beachfront. But such a situation would not be due to the existence of the proposed project.

G. Would the project conflict with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?

No Impact:

The proposed project would consist of improvements in an existing City park. The project would not conflict with any policies related to alternative transportation.

XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Would the project::

- A. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?**
- B. Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?**
- C. Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?**
- D. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlement and resources, or are new or expanded entitlement needed?**
- E. Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?**
- F. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?**
- G. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?**

No Impact:

The proposed project is not expected to place an undue burden on any utility or service system. The project would involve improvements to a portion of an existing park adjacent to the beach. All utilities are in place. The project includes the development of new restroom facilities as part of the improvements. The facilities would meet all current regulations related to conservation.

XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

- A. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or**

wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

No Impact:

The proposed project would be located within an established urbanized setting. There would be no anticipated substantial reduction to any known fish or wildlife species.

- B. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?**

No Impact:

The proposed project is not anticipated to have a cumulative considerable effect on the environment. The project involves the stabilization of a bluff that is located on the southern portion of Bixby Park. Improvements and amenities will be added to the top of the bluff, along the slope and at the bottom of the bluff, all on public park land.

- C. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?**

No Impact:

The proposed project will not create substantial adverse effects to human life, either directly or indirectly.

**MITIGATION MONITORING PLAN
NEGATIVE DECLARATION 36-03
PROPOSED BIXBY PARK REDEVELOPMENT
2300 EAST OCEAN BOULEVARD**

I. AESTHETICS

- I-1 All exterior security lighting and decorative lighting installed at the project site shall include light and glare shields so as to avoid any light intrusion onto adjacent or abutting residential buildings pursuant to Section 21.41.259.

TIMING: Show on plans; Inspection of completed project.

ENFORCEMENT: Department of Planning & Building

XI. NATIONAL POLLUTION DISCHARGE ELIMINATION SYSTEM (NPDES)

- XI-1 Prior to the release of the grading permit, the applicant shall prepare and submit for approval a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) that covers all activity during grading and construction of the project. The SWPPP shall include all appropriate construction site Best Management Practices (BMPs) as listed on the project plans.

TIMING: Prior to issuance of Grading Permit

ENFORCEMENT: Department of Planning & Building

XII. NOISE

- XI-1 Any person(s) associated with the proposed project shall only operate or permit the operation of any tools or equipment used for site preparation, construction or any other related building activity which produce loud or unusual noise which annoys or disturbs a reasonable person of normal sensitivity between the following hours:

Weekdays	7:00am to 7:00pm
Saturdays	9:00am to 6:00pm
Sundays	No work permitted.
Holidays	No work permitted

TIMING: During grading and construction.

ENFORCEMENT: Department of Planning & Building